

REMARKS

Claims 1-13 are pending. The Office Action dated September 20, 2004 has been carefully considered. The above amendments and the following remarks are presented in a sincere attempt to place this Application in condition for allowance. Claim 1 has been amended in this Response, and Claim 13 has been added. Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested in light of the above amendments and following remarks.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102

Claims 1-12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,474,810 to Ng (“Ng”). Insofar as they may be applied against the Claims, these rejections are overcome.

Rejected independent Claim 1 as now amended more particularly recites one of the distinguishing characteristics of the present invention, namely, “the flange is locatable in the clip in a complimentary fit of their respective cross-sectional perimeters.” Support for this Amendment can be found, among other places, in Figure 12 and Claims 3 and 4 of the original Application.

Ng does not teach, suggest, or disclose the use of a complimentary fit of the respective cross-sectional perimeters of a bridge clip assembly and a flange. Figure 1 of Ng explicitly shows that ridge vertical face (38) of primary bridge (34) is inclined on a vertical angle shallower than 90 degrees, but auxiliary bridge face (70) is orthogonal to the both upper projection (62) and lower projection (62) of auxiliary bridge (60). Therefore, it can be clearly seen that only upper projection (62) and lower projection (62) of auxiliary bridge (60) provide forces supporting the auxiliary lens assembly.

By having a complimentary fit of the respective cross-sectional perimeters of bridge clip assembly 212 and flange 112, as shown in FIGURE 12 of the original Application, additional

holding forces can be provided. The auxiliary bridge clip 212 of the present invention allows both horizontal surfaces to provide supporting forces similar to Ng. However, due to the complementary fit, the vertical surface, and any curved surface therebetween, provide additional supporting forces. In other words, the present invention of Claim 1 provides both horizontal and vertical support forces which Ng does not provide. The combination of these two forces, thus, decreases the likelihood of disengagement of when either horizontal or vertical separating forces are applied during usage.

It is now apparent that the cited reference does not disclose, teach or suggest the unique combination now recited in amended Claim 1. Applicant therefore submits that amended Claim 1 is clearly and precisely distinguishable over the cited reference in a patentable sense, and is therefore allowable over this reference and the remaining references of record. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) in view of Ng be withdrawn and that Claim 1 be allowed.

Claims 2-12 depend on and further limit amended Claim 1. Hence, for at least the aforementioned reasons, these Claims would be deemed to be in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of dependent Claims 2-12 also be withdrawn.

Newly Added Claim

Claims 13-15 have been added. Support for Claims 13-15 can be found in paragraphs [0058] and [0059] and in Fig. 11. Therefore, no new matter has been added.

CONCLUSION

On the basis of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that all of the stated grounds for rejection of the Applicants' claims have been addressed and/or traversed.

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
ELTE 02842 PTUS

PATENT APPLICATION
SERIAL NO. 10/767,537

Specifically, Applicant submits that amendments to Claim 1 eliminate the rejections of independent Claim 1 and dependent Claims 2-12 under 35 USC §102(e) in view of on Ng.

Applicant respectfully requests a two month extension of time and have included a check in the amount of two hundred and twenty-five dollars (\$225.00) to cover the fee for a two month extension. In the event that any fees are due, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any required fees due (other than issue fees), and to credit any overpayment made, in connection with the filing of this paper to Deposit Account No. 50-2180 of Storm LLP.

Should the Examiner require any further clarification to place this application in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Storm LLP

John G. Fischer
Reg. No. 41,748

Dated: 2/21/05
Storm LLP
901 Main Street
Suite 7100
Dallas, Texas 75202
Telephone: (214) 347-4703
Fax: (214) 347-4799